

**REMARKS**

Filed herewith is a terminal disclaimer which overcomes the rejection based on U.S. Patent 6,676,880.

The rejection of claim 1 as being unpatentable over Adams et al. in view of Hori et al. is respectfully traversed. Adams et al. discloses a process for extruding polymer materials using dielectric heat alone or in combination with conventional heating. Column 4, lines 15 through 59 requires that the starting material of the process of the Adams invention (that is, the polymeric material to be sintered) must be a polymeric material with a sufficiently high "loss factor" to be effectively heated with dielectric heat above 0.08. PTFE is not disclosed by Adams as a material suitable for the process. PTFE has a dielectric loss factor of about 0.0002, far below the 0.08 limit (see specification sheets from the PAR Group and from DuPont that are filed herewith that show a loss or dissipation factor of 0.0002 for PTFE). Moreover, starting at column 2, line 60 through column 3, line 8, Adams et al expressly teaches against admixing the starting material with volatile components. It is believed that one skilled in the art could fairly consider these teachings to exclude the use of PTFE as a starting material, and particularly when admixed with an additive such as graphite to enhance its susceptibility to dielectric heating since such could be considered volatile within the context of Adams et al. Instead, Adams et al. carefully selects the material based on its dielectric properties which are favorable to dielectric heating, and further selects a combination of particle sizes as taught at column 7, lines 23-27 and lines 54-62, in combination with an amount of water as disclosed at column 7, line 62 through column 8, line 2 to achieve the best results with dielectric heating. In view of these express teachings, it is respectfully submitted that one

**Appln. No.: 10/643,097**  
**Amdt. dated March 11, 2005**  
**Reply to Office action of December 22, 2004**

skilled in the art would not look to Hori et al. as a motivation for utilizing the PTFE material of Hori in the process of Adams et al., since the material of Hori fails to meet the criteria for a suitable starting material set forth in Adams et al. It is respectfully submitted, therefore, that the rejection of claim 1 is improper and should be withdrawn.

The remaining claims depend, ultimately, on claim 1 and are believed to be allowable for the same reasons as claim 1. The dependent claims distinguish over their parent and one another by reciting applicant's invention in greater detail.

It is believed that this application now is in condition for allowance. Further and favorable action is requested.

The Patent Office is authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 06-0420 in the amount of \$110.00 in payment of the Terminal Disclaimer to Obviate A Double Patenting Rejection Over a "Prior" Patent fee.

The Patent Office is authorized to charge or refund any fee deficiency or excess to Deposit Account No. 06-0420.

Respectfully submitted,

**HOWARD & HOWARD ATTORNEYS, P.C.**



**March 11, 2005**

Date

**Robert L. Stearns, Registration No. 36,937**  
The Pinehurst Office Center, Suite #101  
39400 Woodward Avenue  
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48304-5151  
(248) 723-0427